



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,744	08/24/2001	Yumin Mao	34606PCTUSAA; 072975.0111	4091
21003	7590	08/13/2003		

BAKER & BOTTs
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

WHISENANT, ETHAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1634	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,744	MAO ET AL.	
	Examiner Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 MAY 03 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10,12 and 14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 11,13 and 15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____ .

NON-FINAL ACTION

1. The applicant's Response (filed 12 MAY 03) to the Office Action (mailed 12 FEB 03) has been entered. **Claim(s) 1-15** is/are pending. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous office action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either newly applied or reiterated. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligations under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

4. **Claim(s) 1-10, 12, and 14** is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soares et al. [US 5,482,845 (1996)] in view of Adams et al. [Nature (SEP 1995)].

Soares et al teach a method of cDNA sequencing which comprises all of the limitations recited in Claim 1 except these authors do not explicitly teach hybridizing and subtracting the homogenized cDNA library with probes corresponding to the clones sequenced previously. However, Adams et al. do teach hybridizing and subtracting cDNA libraries with probes corresponding to the clones sequenced previously. See, for example, the first paragraph in the 1st Column on page 6 wherein these authors teach:

“Several cDNA libraries contained one or more extremely abundant species (more than 5% of the sequenced clones). In these cases, the individual abundant cDNAs or total cDNA was labeled and used as a probe to screen gridded arrays of clones from the library. Non-hybridizing clones were chosen for sequencing. This procedure was applied to 52 Libraries (indicated in Table 2); 15,521 ESTs in the data set are from screened libraries. These data were not used to estimate quantitative differences between libraries; in other respects, these ESTs were treated in the same way as ESTs from non-screened libraries.”

In view of these findings and absent an unexpected result it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Soares et al. wherein the homogenized cDNA library of Soares et al. is hybridized and subtracted with probes corresponding to the clones sequenced previously. The motivation for making this modification would have been to eliminate extremely abundant species of cDNAs from the clones to be sequenced.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

5. **Claim(s) 11 and 13** is /are objected to because it is dependent upon a rejected independent base claim.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT/ ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claimed invention have been fully and carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

CONCLUSION

7. Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected and/or objected to for the reason(s) set forth above.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6567. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30AM -5:30PM EST or any time via voice mail. If repeated attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached at (703) 308-1152.

The fax number for this Examiner is (703) 746-8465. Before faxing any papers please inform the examiner to avoid lost papers. Please note that the faxing of papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



ETHAN WHISENANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER